IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE THIRD DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B.PRAKASH RAO

WRIT PETITION NO : 3649 of 2004

Between:

V.Ratnamma, W/o. late Pulla Reddy,
Occ:House Hold, R/o. Kharmanghat Village,

Saroornagar Mandal, L.B.Nagar Municipality,

Ranga Reddy District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1. The Superintendent of Police,

Ranga Reddy District at Lakdikapool,
Hyderabad.
2. The Inspector of Police,

Saroornagar Police Station,
Dilsukhnagar, Hyderabad.
3. Sub Inspector of police,

Saroornagar Police Station,
Dilsukhnagar, Hyderabad.

....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ or order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus, declaring the action of the 3rd respondent high-handedly interfering with peaceful possession and enjoyment of the petitioner over the Plot admeasuring 581 sq.yards in Sy.No.221 situated at Kharmanghat Village, Saroornagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, as bad, arbitrary, illegal, without jurisdiction and consequently

direct the respondents not to interfere with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the petitioner over the plot admeasuring 581 sq.yards in Sy.No.221 situated at Kharmanghat Village, saroornagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.C.DAMODHAR REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent No.: GP FOR HOME

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

Heard both sides and at the request of both the counsel, the main writ petition itself is taken up for final disposal.

The only grievance of the petitioner is that though the petitioner is in possession and enjoyment of the property in question in Sy.No.221 situated at Kharmanghat Village, Saroornagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, especially the third respondent is interfering with her possession and enjoyment of the property.

In the counter affidavit filed by the respondents apart from making reference to other several allegations in Para 7 it is specifically stated that the respondents never interfered with her possession and enjoyment of the property and there is no iota of truth in the said allegations.

Recording the same no further orders are necessary. The writ petition is accordingly closed. No order as to costs.

_____ B. PRAKASH RAO, J

Dated: 03-09-2004

LSK/SJ

To

1. The Superintendent of Police,

Ranga Reddy District at Lakdikapool,
Hyderabad.
2. The Inspector of Police,

Saroornagar Police Station,
Dilsukhnagar, Hyderabad.
3. The Sub Inspector of police,

Saroornagar Police Station,
Dilsukhnagar, Hyderabad.

4. Two C.Cs. to the Government Pleader for Home,

High Court Buildings, Hyderabad, (OUT)

5. Two C.D. copies.